DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 250 FL 018 543

AUTHOR Berney, Tomi D.; Simon, Monique S.
TITLE Summer Bilingual Program, 1989. OREA Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
PUB DATE Feb 90
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education Programs; *English (Second Language); *Graduation Requirements; High Schools; High School Students; Limited English Speaking; Mathematics Instruction; Program Evaluation; Science Instruction; Second Language Instruction; Social Studies; *Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS Content Area Teaching; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The 1989 Summer Bilingual Program, funded for its third year by tax levy, served 2,365 limited-English-proficient high school students at 14 sites in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens. Designed for the substantial number of students who are over-age for their grade, the program offered the English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) and bilingual content courses needed for graduation. In response to recommendations from previous years, staff development was also offered. The program operated in conjunction with regular summer schools at each site. Program objectives were met in ESL and science instruction and came close in mathematics. Evaluation data on social studies were not available. The staff were supportive of program objectives but felt its weakness was in implementation. The most common criticisms were inadequate preparation time, lack of materials, incomplete transcript information from home schools, insufficient bilingual staff, a compressed learning schedule, and need for central coordination. Recommendations for program improvement include recruitment of more licensed and experienced bilingual staff, pre-session and continuing staff development, enlisting the cooperation of home school guidance counselors for improved placement, more central coordination to insure timely materials dissemination, rescheduled course and lunch hours, and collection of data for program evaluation. (MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

# OREA Report

## EVALUATION SECTION REPORT

## SUMMER BILINGUAL PROGRAM
## 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Tobias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL019543

*EVALUATION SECTION*
*John E. Schoener, Chief Administrator*
*February 1990*

# *EVALUATION SECTION REPORT*

## *SUMMER BILINGUAL PROGRAM*
## *1989*

*Prepared by*
*The Muliticultural Education Evaluation Unit*
*Tomi Deutsch Berney, Unit Manager*
*Monique S. Simón, Evaluation Consultant*

*Ney York City Board of Education*
*Office of Reasearch, Evaluation, and Assessment*
*Robert Tobias, Director*

## NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Robert F. Wagner, Jr.
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Gwendolyn C. Baker
Amalia V. Betanzos
Stephen R. Franse
James F. Regan
Edward L. Sadowsky
Members

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

---

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201; or to the Director, Office for Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

---

1/1/90

LE

# 1989 SUMMER BILINGUAL PROGRAM

## SUMMARY


- The 1989 Summer Bilingual Program was fully implemented. Students received instruction in English as a Second Language and bilingual content areas.

- Based on analysis of the limited data submitted by schools, students met the objectives in E.S.L. and the content area objective in science. They came close to meeting it in mathematics. No data were available for the social studies objective. The project did not meet the staff development objective.

The 1989 Summer Bilingual Program, funded for its third year by tax levy monies, served 2,365 ninth through twelfth grade Limited English Proficient (LEP) students at 14 sites in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens. Designed for the substantial number of LEP students who were over-age for their grade, the program offered students the English as a Second Language (E.S.L.) and bilingual content area courses they needed for graduation. In response to recommendations from previous years, the program also included staff development.

The Summer Bilingual Program operated in conjunction with the summer school sessions at each site. Students enrolled for up to three E.S.L. and bilingual content area courses. An Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) staff member interviewed the program's administrative, counseling, and teaching staff, and observed classes. OREA collected data on program students, but the statistical analysis was limited because of a lack of data.

Students met the program objectives in E.S.L. and science and came close to meeting it in mathematics. It was impossible for OREA to assess the objective in social studies because the schools failed to return the necessary data. It was apparent, however, that the program enabled many to advance in their studies and facilitated timely graduation.

The staff was supportive of the program's objectives but felt that its weakness lay in implementation. The most common criticisms were: inadequate preparation time, lack of materials, incomplete transcript information from home schools, insufficient bilingual staff, a compressed learning schedule, and a need for central coordination.

The conclusions, based on the findings of this evaluation lead to the following recommendations:

- Intensify efforts to recruit more licensed and experienced bilingual staff.

- Implement staff development sessions before the summer session begins and continue staff development activities throughout the program.
- Enlist the cooperation of home school guidance counselors to expedite the appropriate placement of students.
- Provide more central coordination to insure that materials are disseminated in a timely fashion.
- Reschedule summer session hours so that there is a half-hour lunch break before the third ninety-minute class.
- Collect the required data so as to make possible the assessment of program objectives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | History of Program | 1 |
| | Participating Students | 2 |
| | Delivery of Services | 2 |
| | Report Format | 2 |
| II. | EVALUATION METHODOLOGY | 4 |
| | Evaluation Questions | 4 |
| | Process/Implementation | 4 |
| | Outcome | 4 |
| | Evaluation Procedures | 4 |
| | Sample | 4 |
| | Instruments | 5 |
| | Data Collection | 5 |
| | Data Analysis | 5 |
| III. | EVALUATION FINDINGS | 6 |
| | Student Placement and Programming | 6 |
| | Instructional Activities | 7 |
| | English as a Second Language | 7 |
| | Content Area Subjects | 8 |
| | Limitations | 10 |
| | Non-Instructional Activities | 10 |
| | Staff Development | 10 |
| IV. | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 12 |

## LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

TABLE 1. Program Sites by Borough ..... 3

# I. INTRODUCTION

This report documents the findings of the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment's (OREA's) evaluation of the 1989 Summer Bilingual Program. In its third year of operation, and funded by tax-levy monies, the Summer Bilingual program served 2,365 ninth through twelfth grade Limited English Proficient (LEP) students at 14 schools; this represented an increase over the previous year of four schools and 1,194 students. The program offered students both English as a Second Language (E.S.L.) courses and the content area courses required for graduation.

The Summer Bilingual Program's objectives were to allow students to remain on or get back to grade level, enable students to enrich their education through additional school courses, and provide sufficiently mature and able students with the opportunity to complete their high school programs in less than the normally required time.

## HISTORY OF THE PROGRAM

In April 1987, principals of high schools with large LEP populations conducted a citywide study which revealed that a significant portion of LEP students were far enough behind schedule in completing their required courses that they would not be able to graduate after four years of study and, therefore, were at risk of dropping out. The Summer Bilingual Program sought to enhance LEP students' chances for timely advancement and graduation and thus lower the dropout rate. (A

more detailed description of the program's history can be found in the final reports of 1987 and 1988.)

PARTICIPATING STUDENTS

The Summer Bilingual program was implemented at 14 sites in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens. (See Table 1.) The program served LEP students who were typically over-age for their grade. Spanish, Chinese, and Haitian Creole were the most common native languages of program students.

DELIVERY OF SERVICES

The program operated in conjunction with the regular English-language summer school program. Program staff and school staff were interchangeable. Students attended three ninety-minute classes five days a week. The program provided E.S.L. classes at all sites. For the first time, most sites were also able to offer bilingual content area courses this year.

REPORT FORMAT

This report is organized as follows: Chapter II describes the evaluation methodology; Chapter III presents an analysis of the qualitative and quantitative findings of the evaluation; and Chapter IV offers conclusions and recommendations based upon the results of the evaluation.

TABLE 1

PROGRAM SITES BY BOROUGH

| Borough | High School |
|---|---|
| Brooklyn | Eastern District<br>Erasmus Hall<br>Franklin D. Roosevelt<br>John Dewey<br>Midwood<br>New Utrecht |
| Bronx | Adlai E. Stevenson<br>Morris<br>Theodore Roosevelt |
| Manhattan | George Washington<br>Martin Luther King, Jr.<br>Seward Park |
| Queens | Long Island City<br>Newtown |

- A total of 14 high schools participated in the 1989 Summer Bilingual Program.
- The largest number of participating high schools was in the borough of Brooklyn.

## II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

### EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation assesses two major areas: program implementation and outcomes. Evaluation questions included the following:

#### Process/Implementation

- Did the program select students for program participation according to specific criteria?
- Did the program place target students according to their current level of performance?
- Did the program implement staff development activities as planned?

#### Outcome

- What percentage of program students passed their courses in mathematics, science, and social studies?
- What percentage of program staff were satisfied with their training in terms of its relevance, applicability, comprehensibility, and accuracy?

### EVALUATION PROCEDURES

#### Sample

OREA field consultants visited three sites: Seward Park, Eastern District, and Theodore Roosevelt High Schools, in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx respectively. OREA selected these schools because they had representative student populations. Field consultants interviewed teachers, guidance counselors, and administrative staff and observed classes in

E.S.L. and bilingual content areas.

Instruments

OREA developed questionnaires for site supervisors, guidance counselors, and teachers, as well as surveys for students. OREA staff translated student surveys into Spanish, Haitian Creole, Chinese, and Korean.

Data Collection

Consultants interviewed program staff and observed classes over a three-week period from July 26 to August 14, 1989. OREA distributed student data forms to the program directors in early August and received the completed forms from the sites in early September.

Data Analysis

Although a total of 2,365 students participated in the 1989 Summer Bilingual Program, analysis of objectives was based on 486 or fewer students because of missing data. OREA determined whether or not the program objectives were met by obtaining frequencies.

## III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

The 1989 Summer Bilingual program provided students with E.S.L. and bilingual content area courses in social studies, mathematics, and science.

### STUDENT PLACEMENT AND PROGRAMMING

To participate, students had to demonstrate limited English proficiency. Students were designated as LEP if they scored under the twenty-first percentile on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB).* In addition to the score on the LAB, eligibility guidelines reflected the program's goals. Enrollment was open to LEP students in three categories: high school seniors who needed three subjects in order to graduate by August 1989; ninth- through twelfth-graders who had failed subjects; and students who wished to accelerate their studies.

The criteria used to place students at different levels of E.S.L. instruction and in bilingual content area courses included data taken from student's records, guidance counselor recommendations, placement tests where appropriate, and student requests. Teachers, counselors, and administrative staff repeatedly criticized the placement process. The major

---

*The Language Assessment Battery (LAB) was developed by the Board of Education of the City of New York to measure the English-language proficiency of non-native speakers for English in order to determine whether their level of English proficiency is sufficient to enable them to participate effectively in classes taught in English. Students scoring below the twenty-first percentile on the LAB are entitled to bilingual and E.S.L. services.

problem was that home schools were supposed to give each student a "Summer School Application and Transcript Card" that determined their placement. Schools frequently provided these late or in an incomplete state, or did not provide them at all. Summer school staff often had to spend valuable teaching time determining students' placement.

## INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

### English as a Second Language

Implementation. The E.S.L. classes observed by OREA field consultants focused on grammar, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and verbal and writing skills.

In a level 3 E.S.L. class at Eastern District High School, students recited ten vocabulary words in unison, three times with their teacher and once without. The teacher reviewed the meaning of the words by asking students for definitions and by giving a formal definition for each. Students then took turns reading passages containing their vocabulary words aloud from their workbooks. The teacher then divided the class into small groups to answer reading comprehension questions. The teacher checked the answers and made corrections where necessary. Students then wrote sentences using the vocabulary words. Volunteers read sentences to the class and the teacher corrected the grammar.

At Theodore Roosevelt High School a level 6 E.S.L. class focused on reading comprehension, vocabulary identification, and writing. The topic for the day was the various forms of

marriage. Students discussed the positive and negative characteristics of the different types of marriage they had read about in a magazine article. Students read vocabulary words and phrases aloud and gave meanings for them. The students then wrote about the form of marriage they preferred.

Outcome. The program objective for E.S.L. was:

- Seventy-five percent of the participating students will pass their E.S.L. courses with a minimum grade of 65.

Data were available for 21 percent (486) of the students. Of these, 78 percent (379) obtained a score of at least 65 on the final test. The program met this objective for E.S.L., based on those students for whom there were data.

Content Area Subjects

Implementation. An OREA consultant observed two bilingual content area classes: global history (Chinese) at Seward Park High School and economics (Spanish) at Eastern District High School. Both classes focused on teaching students subject material and English names and expressions for key terms and concepts.

The global history class examined how certain geographical conditions had affected Italy's early development. Students identified Italy, Rome, and the Alps on the class map. The class was primarily lecture, but students' questions and responses were integrated throughout. Students were able to answer questions based on the day's lesson and draw parallels

between Italy and other countries. At the end of the lesson, students read aloud the summary notes written in English on the board. They repeated key phrases and terms in English, then wrote them in both English and Chinese in their notebooks.

The economics class concentrated on inflation and its causes. Students participated by discussing their experiences with inflation in their native countries. They also discussed such concepts as cost of living, standard of living, and budgeting. The teacher used charts, graphs, and mathematics to aid in her explanations. The class read in Spanish, repeating English translations for economic terms and basic consumer goods such as bread, oil, and clothing.

Outcome. The program objective for content area subjects was:

- Seventy-five percent of the participating students will pass their content area courses with a minimum grade of 65.

Data were available for 16 percent (374) of the students taking science. Of these, 90 percent (337) obtained a score of at least 65.

Seventy-one percent of the students taking mathematics, for whom data were available, achieved a score of 65 or above.

No data were available for students enrolled in social studies.

The Summer Bilingual Program partially met its objective in content area subjects.

Limitations

Among the instructional limitations were a lack of materials, a compressed learning schedule, and a lack of staff. Both teachers and site supervisors felt that guidebooks outlining class material and giving suggestions on how to conduct a 90-minute class were needed to alleviate problems caused by the short preparation time allotted by summer contracts. Many E.S.L. classes lacked adequate texts and materials, and bilingual content area teachers said that they needed more native language texts.

Problems also stemmed from the scheduling of three consecutive 90-minute periods of instruction. By the third period, teachers and students were tired. Many students used the first 15 minutes of this period for a lunch break. This cut class time in the already shortened six-week summer session.

Most sites were inadequately staffed. Bilingual teachers, difficult to recruit during the school year, were even more scarce in the summer. As a result, many high schools could not offer requested content area courses. In some cases, teachers not qualified to handle the intensive summer session were dismissed in the first few days of classes. Their classes were either canceled or combined.

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Staff Development

Implementation. In response to OREA's recommendation in its previous report, the Summer Bilingual Program included staff

development as a program component. Training activities varied by site. At some schools, site and subject area supervisors conducted periodic training sessions. They gave teachers tips, for example, on how to approach a 90-minute lesson. Central staff developers visited most schools, observing classes and offering suggestions. A small number of teachers (3 of the 28 who responded) reported that they had received no such visitors.

While the staff was supportive of the program's training objective, they felt there were limitations to its implementation. The most common criticism was that there was not enough central coordination. Staff felt that there should be a program coordinator who outlined the program, supervised group training sessions, and made sure materials were properly disseminated. Respondents suggested that time be allotted for preparing staff before the start of the summer session. They also maintained that staff developers provide training throughout the six-week period.

Outcome. The program objective for staff development was:

- Eighty-five percent of staff will be satisfied with their training as demonstrated by Likert scale scores between 4 and 5 (on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being the highest) on a "Staff Satisfaction Questionnaire."

Only 65 percent of program staff gave scores of four or five to the relevance, applicability, comprehensibility, and accuracy of their training. The Summer Bilingual Project of 1989 did not meet its staff development objective.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1989 Summer Bilingual Program offered LEP students the opportunity to progress in their required course sequences toward timely graduation through a variety of E.S.L. and content area courses. The program achieved its objectives in E.S.L. and science and came close to meeting its objective in mathematics. A lack of data made it impossible to ascertain whether or not it was successful in social studies. It was apparent from available data that the program was at least partially successful in its instructional component.

Staff indicated that they were supportive of the program's objectives but that they had encountered many problems with program implementation this year. The most common criticisms were inadequate preparation time, insufficient bilingual staff, lack of materials, incomplete transcript information from home schools, and a compressed learning schedule.

While the 65 percent who indicated that they were satisfied with the staff development was certainly under the 85 percent proposed in the objective, it does indicate that more than half the teachers were satisfied with this component of the program. It is a beginning that the program can improve upon next year.

The conclusions based on the findings of this evaluation lead to the following recommendations:

- Intensify efforts to recruit more licensed and experienced bilingual staff.

- Implement staff development sessions before the summer session begins and continue staff development activities throughout the program.

- Enlist the cooperation of home school guidance counselors to expedite the appropriate placement of students.

- Provide more central coordination to insure that materials are disseminated in a timely fashion.

- Reschedule summer session hours so that there is a half-hour lunch break before the third ninety minute class.

- Collect the required data so as to make possible the assessment of program objectives.